



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/896,058	06/29/2001	Shigekazu Orita	188-87	9455
28249	7590	05/13/2005	EXAMINER	
DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP 333 EARLE OVINGTON BLVD. UNIONDALE, NY 11553			TORRES VELAZQUEZ, NORCA LIZ	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

1771

DATE MAILED: 05/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/896,058

Applicant(s)

ORITA ET AL.

Examiner

Norca L. Torres-Velazquez

Art Unit

1771

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 10 and 13-15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

HL

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed March 3, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

a. Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to include the language: “*and provides portions (3) between the upper and lower ground structures (1,1) omitting connecting thread (2) and situated between portions containing the connecting thread (2) between the upper and lower ground structures (1,1)*”. Further, the claims have been amended to include reference numerals to enhance comprehension and that refer to preferred embodiments illustrated in the drawings of the present application.

It is noted that the use of reference characters is to be considered as having no effect on the scope of the claims. See MPEP § 608.01(m). As stated in the previous action, the language recited in the present amendment is still indefinite since it is still not clear what is meant in the third paragraph of claim 1 as currently amended.

b. With regards to the ROELL reference, Applicants indicate that it fails to contain any suggestion of metal plating of the layers therein. Applicants refer to Col. 4; lines 20-38 to indicate that the reference relates to changing the pile thread material and not the covering layers. The Examiner had cited Col. 4, lines 56-58 which teaches that the textile spacer material and/or the pile threads can be surface-modified. Applicants indicate that there is no further suggestion of what kind of coating or how such coating might be applied and further that in Col. 5, lines 4-8 it is taught using a resin. Applicants conclude that ROELL fails to contain even a remote suggestion of applying metal to his material structure, much less applying a conductive metal layer.

It is noted that the ROELL reference uses the resin indicated by Applicants as a possibility for applications that require stringent mechanical requirements, particularly with respect to tear resistance and shock absorption. (Col. 5, lines 4-35) While the

reference does not literally indicate the use of a metal layer, it is noted that the reference recognizes the use of the textile material in applications such as electric blankets (Col. 6, line 9). Therefore, it is the Examiner's interpretation that such teaching would suggest the use of conductive materials.

c. With regards to the EBNETH reference, Applicants argue that the reference fails to contain any recognition of the advantages of improved shielding and reduced compressive stress, separation of coating and cutting debris attained by the present invention as documented in the present application.

It is noted herein that the Examiner is relying in the EBNETH reference to provide the structure of ROELL with a conductive metal layer by electroless plating.

Applicant's arguments are not commensurate in scope with the claims since the present claims are not claiming the argued improvements. However, it is the Examiner's position that such "advantages" would have been expected from the combination of ROELL and EBNETH. For example, it is noted that the ROELL reference teaches using the textile spacer material of their invention for replacing foamed substances producing a structure with the compressibility known from flexible foams. (Abstract) Therefore, the reduced compressive stress would be expected. With regards to the improved shielding, it is noted the EBNETH teaches the use of metallised textile materials (such as knitted fabrics) for surface heating elements, for wall heating systems, heating flippers, heatable clothing and the like; and also for wall coverings for electromagnetically screening off rooms from monitoring equipment. (Col. 3, lines 37-47) It is the Examiner's position that such applications are compatible with applications taught by ROELL (such as electric blankets), therefore, the coatings taught by EBNETH would have been

recognized in the art of ROELL and the improved shielding would be expected from the structure of ROELL with the coating taught by EBNETH.

d. With regards to the gaps 3 between the connecting thread 2 in the sectional direction, Applicants indicate that ROELL just discloses a continuous matrix of thread structure 3 in Fig. 1 and that there is not the slightest suggestion in ROELL of any interruption in the sectional direction of the matrices shown in Figs. 1-9.

It is noted that the present application fails to show the interweaving of the upper and lower ground structures and their relation with the “connection thread” of the present invention. Therefore, it is the Examiner’s interpretation that at the point of interweaving of the pile thread 5 with the threads 4 of the covering layers 1, 2 of the ROELL reference as illustrated in Figure 9 the pile thread 5 does not constitute a “connection thread” but part of the weave of the covering layers, providing an interruption in the sectional direction of the matrix. It is further included herein a copy of EP 0748889 A2 that illustrates double rib knit Raschel structures to produce space knit-goods that show constructions with the argued interruptions. (Refer to figures)

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the term “well” is not recognized in the knit art, this seems to be a typographical error it should be substituted by the term - - wale - -. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 10, 13, 14 and 15 are objected to because of the following informalities: uses the term “well” when it should be - - wale - -. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1-4 and 6-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is not clear what is meant in Claim 1 by "...at a sectional portion of the three dimensionally knitted base material, the direction in which the connection thread is arranged avoids intersecting the sectional plane." This is only described in the same way on page 7 of the specification. For examining purposes, the Examiner uses as reference Figure 1 which shows the presently claimed connection threads. It is noted that the use of reference characters is to be considered as having no effect on the scope of the claims. See MPEP § 608.01(m). As stated in the previous action, the language recited in the present amendment is still indefinite since it is still not clear what is meant in the third paragraph of claim 1 as currently amended. Claims 2-4 and 6-16 are also rejected as being dependent on claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 1771

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

7. Claims 1-4 and 6-16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by SHIODA et al. (US 6,569,789 B1) which has an effective filing date of Feb. 3, 1999.

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

SHIODA et al. teaches a conductive material suitable as a gasket material for shielding the electromagnetic wave. The composite material is composed of a synthetic fiber-structured sheet and a porous synthetic resin sheet integrally bonded to each other and is plate with a metal. (Abstract; claims) The fiber-structured sheets include knit cloths and include an organic fiber. (Col. 3, lines 38-41) The reference teaches using a double raschel knit material. (Col. 7, line 44) The porous synthetic resin sheet used in the invention is a soft foamed sheet of three-

Art Unit: 1771

dimensional network structure. (Col. 3, lines 55-57) The reference teaches using electroless plating to metallise the composite material. (Col. 4, lines 34-37) It is noted that the language of the present invention is open-ended (comprising) and does not preclude the inclusion of the foamed layer taught by the SHIODA et al. reference. With regards to the structure of the knit fabric, it is noted that the reference teaches the use of a double raschel knit material and as stated above, this construction is known to provide the three-dimensional structure claimed herein.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-4 and 7-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ROELL (US 5,589,245) in view of EBNETH (US 4,201,825) and further evidenced by EP 0748889 A2.

ROELL discloses a textile spacer material that consists of two covering layers 1 and 2, preferably of knitted fabric, which are connected by the pile thread structure 3. (Column 1, lines 48-50) It is noted that the structure taught by ROELL reads on the claimed three dimensionally knitted base material composed of an upper ground structure, a lower ground structure and connection thread interconnecting the two layers. With regards to the heat-fusing thread, it is noted that the ROELL reference teaches that the mechanical and physiological properties of the textile spacer material can be varied depending in the selection of the thread material or other classic process parameter of production. The reference gives as example the use of a

Art Unit: 1771

temperature sensitive material. (Refer to Column 4, lines 20-38) ROELL further teaches that the textile spacer material can be coated and/or the pile threads can be surface-modified. (Column 4, lines 56-60) ROELL teaches the use of the textile spacer material as a filter material, and indicates that special properties can also be formed by appropriately pre-treating the thread material for the pile thread structure and/or post-treating the textile spacer material. (Column 4, lines 61-65) The reference also teaches that the entire textile spacer material can be impregnated and that a sheathing of the threads can result depending on the type and quantity of the impregnation. (Column 5, lines 4-8)

With regard to the limitation of claim 1 requiring that "...at a sectional portion of the three dimensionally knitted base material, the direction in which the connection thread is arranged avoids intersecting the sectional plane", it is the Examiner's position this limitation is met by the invention of ROELL. It is noted that the present application fails to show the interweaving of the upper and lower ground structures and their relation with the "connection thread" of the present invention. Therefore, it is the Examiner's interpretation that at the point of interweaving of the pile thread 5 with the threads 4 of the covering layers 1, 2 of the ROELL reference as illustrated in Figure 9 the pile thread 5 does not constitute a "connection thread" but part of the weave of the covering layers, providing an interruption in the sectional direction of the matrix. It is further included herein a copy of EP 0748889 A2 that illustrates double rib knit Raschel structures to produce space knit-goods that show constructions with the argued interruptions. (Refer to figures)

With regards to claims 8 and 9, it is the Examiner position that the ROELL reference teachings in which the materials used for the pile thread structure are dependent on the intended

Art Unit: 1771

use of the structure, are broad and would encompass the use of heat-fusing threads with melting points in the range of 100 to 190 °C.

While ROELL teaches post-treating the textile spacer material and that the entire textile spacer material, it fails to specifically teach subjecting the material to an electroless plating with at least one conductive metal.

EBNETH teaches a metallized textile material by currentless metal deposition. (Abstract) The reference teaches coating textile structures such as knitted and woven fabrics. (Column 2, lines 15-20) The reference further teaches using the textile material metallised for the production of antistatically filter cloths and further teaches that it is also possible to use a combination of copper plated and nickel plated wall coverings for electromagnetically screening off rooms from monitoring equipment. Electrical equipment can also be readily screened off from foreign waves and interfering frequencies. (Column 3, lines 36-47) With regard to claims 10-16, it is the Examiner's position that the structures disclosed by ROELL In Figures 1-9 read on the structures presently claimed.

Since both references are directed to knitted fabrics, the purpose disclosed by EBNETH would have been recognized in the pertinent art of ROELL.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the three dimensional textile spacer fabric of ROELL and provide with a currentless metal deposition of the entire structure with the motivation of producing an electromagnetically screen as disclosed by EBNETH above.

10. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ROELL and EBNETH as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of ENG et al. (US 5,532,052).

Art Unit: 1771

The ROELL and EBNETH references do not explicitly disclose the use of a Raschel structure.

ENG et al. disclose a camouflage material having radar screening properties comprised of a warp-knitted fabric, so-called Raschel fabric.

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the electromagnetic wave shield and provide it with a Raschel structure with the motivation of producing a light-weight knitted fabric as disclosed by ENG et al. (Refer to Column 1, lines 16-18 and lines 32-33).

11. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ROELL and EBNETH as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of SHIODA et al. (US 6,569,789 B1)

The ROELL and EBNETH references do not explicitly disclose the use of a Raschel structure.

SHIODA et al. teaches a conductive material suitable as a gasket material for shielding the electromagnetic wave. The composite material is composed of a synthetic fiber-structured sheet and a porous synthetic resin sheet integrally bonded to each other and is plate with a metal. (Abstract; claims) The fiber-structured sheets include knit cloths and include an organic fiber. (Col. 3, lines 38-41) The reference teaches using a double raschel knit material. (Col. 7, line 44)

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to provide a double raschel knit material as a suitable fibrous structure for the EMI since this construction is known to provide a lightweight fabric.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

FELDMAN (US 5,974,784) – discloses a heat shield that includes a resinified spaced layer fabric having at least one inner layer, at least one outer layer, and at least one spacer (core or web) in between to form one or more insulative spaces. The heat shield includes an emissivity reducing material. The core or web can be woven or knitted into the face layers during the manufacturing process (Abstract; Col. 2, lines 32-46) The reference teaches depositing a layer of metal on one or more layers of the shield or on the web, preferably before the three dimensional fabric is coated with resin. Suitable processes, such as chemical vapor deposition (CVD) or vacuum deposition. (Col. 3, lines 1-10) It is noted that in Fig. 2, the reference shows a connecting web 23, which forms longitudinally extending hexagonal prisms 24 in the insulative space between the first layer 21 and the second layer 22. (Col. 4, lines 16-22; Col. 2, lines 48-51) The reference teaches the use of graphite fiber or a high-temperature fiberglass fiber, although other fibers are believed to be usable. (Col. 2, lines 52-55)

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1771

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Norca L. Torres-Velazquez whose telephone number is 571-272-1484. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 8:00-4:00 pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris can be reached on 571-272-1478. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Norca L. Torres-Velazquez
Examiner
Art Unit 1771

May 6, 2005



ELIZABETH M. COLE
PRIMARY EXAMINER